

Message

From: Jones, Samantha [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=EAC77FE3B20C4667B8C534C90C15A830-JONES, SAMANTHA]
Sent: 8/12/2014 5:10:48 PM
To: Newhouse, Kathleen [Newhouse.Kathleen@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Ammonia EPR draft word version
Attachments: Trimethylbenzenes_ToxReview_PublicCommentRevisions_v25_HERO_Clean.docx

Hey, my latest copy of ammonia in Word has a Preamble dated January 2013 and didn't include the sections. However, the trimethylbenzenes version in Word that I have does have the sections, although they didn't include a date in the Preamble I am pretty sure it's a later version.

From: Newhouse, Kathleen
Sent: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 12:46 PM
To: Jones, Samantha
Subject: Ammonia EPR draft word version

Samantha, if you have a free minute, can you send me the Ammonia EPR draft word version? I only have the PDF. (Sorry to bug you, but Sue is on vacation and Jamie is home sick.) I'd like use the preamble from it as an example for the tech editors. (They need to add the hero reference subsections that Vince wanted to the most recent BaP preamble- eg, US EPA 2005a, §2.2.1.7).

From: Strong, Jamie
Sent: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 9:36 AM
To: Newhouse, Kathleen
Subject: Re: BaP

I'm home sick. Sam may have it. Sue def does but she is on vacation this week. I can track it down tomorrow.

Sent from my iPhone

On Aug 12, 2014, at 12:09 PM, "Newhouse, Kathleen" <Newhouse.Kathleen@epa.gov> wrote:

The Ammonia Tox review has all the reference subsections called out in their HERO links in the preamble. Do you have a word version of the external review draft you could send me (I only have the PDF)? I can do a compare to see if it is any different than the most recent version of the preamble Marty pasted into BaP.

From: Strong, Jamie
Sent: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 9:01 AM
To: Newhouse, Kathleen
Subject: Re: BaP

If we have done it recently then I would say we have to. I think Martin didn't think it was a big deal? Maybe find out.

Sent from my iPhone

On Aug 12, 2014, at 11:59 AM, "Newhouse, Kathleen" <Newhouse.Kathleen@epa.gov> wrote:

I don't know. It would be more time and money, I am sure, but I am not sure what her rationale is. I can call her and ask since her emails don't seem to be very informative. If other documents have the most recent template, maybe we can just poach a hero formatted version. Maybe from ammonia or TMBs?

From: Strong, Jamie
Sent: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 8:52 AM
To: Newhouse, Kathleen
Subject: Re: BaP

Is the issue time or cost or both?

Sent from my iPhone

On Aug 12, 2014, at 11:50 AM, "Newhouse, Kathleen" <Newhouse.Kathleen@epa.gov> wrote:

They probably can, but Terri told them not to (in a previous email). I can ask her to have them to link the refs in the preamble. We don't have a cost estimate yet.

From: Strong, Jamie
Sent: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 8:36 AM
To: Newhouse, Kathleen
Subject: Re: BaP

Ok. Not sure what to do about preamble. Why can't they link it?

Sent from my iPhone

On Aug 12, 2014, at 11:04 AM, "Newhouse, Kathleen" <Newhouse.Kathleen@epa.gov> wrote:

Depends on if they find any issues that I need to correct. If everything is straightforward, probably a few days.

Are we going to leave the preamble unlinked?

From: Strong, Jamie
Sent: Monday, August 11, 2014 5:46 AM
To: Newhouse, Kathleen
Subject: BaP

If we get the tech edit back the 20th how long do you need to go through it and finalize?